United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,969	10/511,969 05/06/2005		Michael Roelleke	10191/4055	1954
26646	7590	08/25/2006		EXAMINER	
KENYON		ON LLP	TO, TUAN C		
ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2.2 / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				3663	
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/511,969	ROELLEKE ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tuan C. To	3663			
Period for I	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHICH - Extension after SIX - If NO pe - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Downs of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication, riod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vor preply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Junis action is FINAL . 2b) This note this application is in condition for allowards and in accordance with the practice under Expression in the	action is non-final.				
Disposition	of Claims					
4a 5)□ Cl 6)⊠ Cl 7)□ Cl	aim(s) 17-36 is/are pending in the application) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawaim(s) is/are allowed. aim(s) 17-36 is/are rejected. aim(s) is/are objected to. aim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application	Papers					
10)⊠ Th Ap Re	e specification is objected to by the Examine e drawing(s) filed on <u>24 January 2005</u> is/are: oplicant may not request that any objection to the explacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct e oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice o 3) Informat	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) b(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Page 2

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 17-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekizuka et al. (US 6650981B2) and in view of Takagi et al. (US 20010040065A1).

With regard to claims 17-24, Sekizuka et al. discloses a vehicle system for generating a triggering signal for a restraining unit (inflator or seat-belt pre-tensioner),

said such the restraining unit is provided for the event of a collision of the vehicle. Sekizuka et al. disclose a rotation detection unit which is the roll rate sensor (22), and a circuit (10) that processes the signal received from said sensors (Sekizuka et al., figure 1).

The reference to Takagi et al. teaches another system for generating a triggering signal including a collision sensor (9) for detecting a collision (Takagi et al., figure 1), in the event of collision, said sensor generates a signal input to the controller (11).

While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See <u>In re Mraz</u>, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as taught by Sekizuka et al. to include the teachings of Takagi et al. in order to properly deploy a safety device when a collision occurred.

With regard to claim 25-36, Sekizuka et al. disclose a system/method for triggering a restraining unit in a vehicle, the restraining unit being provided for the event of a collision of the vehicle comprising:

A lateral acceleration sensor 21) detects an impact of the vehicle. In the response to the impact signal sensed from the lateral acceleration sensor, the computer output a signal to activate the restraining unit (Sekizuka et al., column 1, lines 52-55), the roll rate sensor (22) detects a possible occurrence of a rotational motion and thus, the roll rate sensor inherently detects an existence of a rotational motion of a vehicle.

The computer unit (10) outputs the triggering signals to trigger the restraining unit such as inflator (31, 33) and seat-belt pre-tensioner (32, 34).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-36 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner,

Art Unit: 3663

Tuan C To

August 20, 2006